

1           35. (Unchanged) The article of claim 33 wherein the machine-accessible  
2 media further includes data, when accessed, results in the machine performing:  
3           recursively decoding the second frame of the frame dependency.

4  
5           36. (Unchanged) The article of claim 33 wherein the machine-accessible  
6 media further includes data for reverse playback of frames of the video stream, when  
7 accessed, results in the machine performing:  
8           determining a second frame is not in the decoded frame cache, the second frame  
9 following the first frame in the video stream;  
10          determining a second frame dependency for the second frame comprising  
11 frames required to decode the second frame;  
12          decoding at least one of the frames of the frame dependency not present in the  
13 decoded frame cache, and placing it in the decoded frame cache; and  
14          decoding the second frame using at least one of the decoded frames in the  
15 decoded frame cache.

## REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are presently active. Claims 1, 15, 26, 27, and 33 are independent.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, and 33, have been amended. The amendments to claims 2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 19, 20, and 21 are non-substantive changes to maintain proper references to amended base claims.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the obvious attention given to this matter.

Regarding Applicant's previous response in which Applicant stated belief the Office misunderstands the difference between the recited "decoded frame cache" and Toebe's use of stored reference frames for decoding MPEG "P" and "B" frames, further explanation may be helpful to appreciate the distinction over Toebe's. Disclosed embodiments teach random access into past MPEG content, and recited embodiments

apply this random access to effectively display an MPEG stream backwards. Applicant acknowledges B and P frames cited by the Office were known to Applicant when conceiving the present invention.

Applicant traverses the rejections in that, as taught by the cited portions of Toebe's, only "the last two reference frames" are kept "available for use in decoding B and P frames" (see. e.g., col. 4 lines 22-23). These two reference frames are "constantly" (col. 4 line 22) updated so that a frame is decoded (line 24) and placed in a "future" buffer, and when a new reference frame is determined, the current "future" frame is displayed and moved into a "past" buffer (lines 27-28). These past/future frames are not what was claimed.

However, in an effort to conclude prosecution, each independent claims series has been amended to recite randomly accessing a frame, maintaining a list of frame dependencies, and using the list at least in part to determine whether a decoded frame is already present in a decoded frame cache. Applicant submits these amendment render the current amendment moot. In particular, Toebe's' use of the two frames, e.g., the "past" and "future" frames, fails to teach or suggest the amended embodiments, and regarding the rejection of claims 9 and 22, these limitations of Toebe's are not cured through application of the cited portions of Proctor (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,830) concerning a least-recently-used cache policy.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that that all active claims are presently in condition for allowance, and their passage to issuance is respectfully solicited.

If the above amendment are not deemed persuasive, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone as Applicants believe such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 16, 2003



Steven D. Yates  
Patent Attorney  
Intel Corporation  
Registration No. 42,242  
(503) 264-6589

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

16 JUNE 2003  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Deposit  
DEBORAH L. HIGMAN  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence  
SDY  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
6/16/03  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date